UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/789,508 | 02/26/2004 | Michael C. Park | 23627-08902 (IMV-098-C1-U | 9100 |
| 758 FENWICK & V | 7590 12/23/200 VEST LLP | EXAMINER | | |
| SILICON VAL | | BELOUSOV, ANDREY | | |
| 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2174 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 12/23/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|---|--|
| | 10/789,508 | PARK ET AL. |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | ANDREY BELOUSOV | 2174 |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply | ppears on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence address |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tired will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |
| Status | | |
| Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 in 18.</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under | is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro | |
| Disposition of Claims | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 15-24 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 15-24 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examination 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable application. | awn from consideration. for election requirement. | Examiner. |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E | ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob | jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | ion No ed in this National Stage |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/04/2008. | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other: | ate |

Art Unit: 2174

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the filing of 11/04/2008. Claims 15-24 are pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 15 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok (5,022,085) in view of Isobe (U.S. Patent No. 5995108.)
- Claim 15, 24: Cok discloses an interactive seamer apparatus for seaming two or more single images vertically or horizontally in a partly overlapping manner into panoramic images, comprising:
 - a. a user interface having a first display area for displaying a panoramic image (Fig. 2; 2:61-69) and
 - b. the two or more single view images having overlapping portions at least partially encompassed by at least one outlined area (3:7-28), each pixel in the overlapping portions encompassed by the outlined area having an opacity value that is determined by the location of the pixel in the outlined area and a predetermined opacity curve (3:29-49; Fig. 4); and

Art Unit: 2174

c. an image seamer for seaming the two or more single view images vertically or horizontally in a partly overlapping manner into the panoramic image (Abstract),

d. wherein the opacity values of the pixels in the overlapping portions encompassed by the outlined area are manually adjusted by changing the size of the outlined area in the second display area (W, 3:39-49.)

However, Cok does not explicitly disclose wherein

e. a second display area for displaying the two or more single view images projected from the panoramic image,

Isobe discloses an apparatus for image seaming wherein a user interface includes

f. a second display area for displaying the two or more single view images projected from the panoramic image (Fig. 6: 321, FileName1, FileName2, etc.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of <u>Cok</u> with the disclosure of <u>Isobe</u>. One would have been motivated to combine the user interface teaching of <u>Isobe</u> with the disclosure of <u>Cok</u> so as to enable a user an interface to readily select a base or paste image to seam.

4. Claims 16-19, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Teo</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,399) in view of <u>Isobe</u> et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,108.)

Application/Control Number: 10/789,508

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 16: <u>Teo</u> discloses an interactive seamer apparatus for seaming two or more single view images vertically or horizontally into panoramic images, comprising:

Page 4

- a. a user interface having a first display area for displaying a panoramic image generated from a number of single view images (Fig. 4: 400), and
- b. wherein an array of two or more control points (Fig. 4: either the set of two 410 points on the left or right) are superimposed within (2:50) an area (Fig. 4: 420) in the panoramic image corresponding to an interior (2:49-57, "selected four points within a given panoramic image") of the selected single view image for manually warping (8:17-21, "reshaping") parts of the panoramic image corresponding to the selected single view image by moving the control points, (8:17-39),
- c. the warping being independent of placement or movement of the selected single view image within the panoramic image (8:22-30); and
- d. an image seamer for seaming the selected single view image into the panoramic image based on user specified parameters (Abstract.)

However, <u>Teo</u> does not explicitly disclose,

 a. a second display area for displaying a selected single view image projected from the panoramic image,

Isobe discloses a similar device for panorama seaming, including a

a. a second display area (Fig. 16: 631) for displaying a selected single view image projected from the panoramic image (Fig. 6: 630.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of <u>Teo</u> with the disclosure of <u>Isobe</u>. One

Art Unit: 2174

would have been motivated to combine the user interface teaching of <u>Isobe</u> with the disclosure of <u>Teo</u> so as to enable a user an interface to readily select images to seam.

Claim 17: Teo and Isobe disclose the interactive seamer of claim 16. Isobe further discloses wherein at least one parameter adjusts the focal length of the selected portion of the panoramic image (Fig 16: 634, 635.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the known technique of adjusting focal length as disclosed by Isobe to improve the similar device such as disclosed by Teo, i.e. panorama editing, in the same way to produce a predictable result.

Claim 18: Teo and Isobe disclose the interactive seamer of claim 16. Isobe further discloses wherein the user interface includes a third display area for displaying values of parameters (Fig. 16: 638.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the known technique of displaying additional parameters (e.g. in text format) as disclosed by Isobe to improve the similar device such as disclosed by Teo, i.e. panorama editing, in the same way to produce a predictable result.

Claim 19: <u>Teo</u> and <u>Isobe</u> disclose the interactive seamer of claim 16. <u>Teo</u> further discloses wherein at least one parameter provides high resolution zoom to enable a user to examine artifacts without requiring a high resolution representation of the entire panoramic image (1:38-44; 2:23-27.)

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 21: Teo and Isobe disclose the interactive seamer of claim 16. Isobe further discloses wherein at least one parameter specifies the lay down order of multiple single view images seamed together to form the panoramic image (Fig. 16: 637.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the known technique of having lay down orders (such as in cases of layers) as disclosed by Isobe to improve the similar device such as disclosed by Teo, i.e. panorama editing, in the same way to produce a predictable result.

Claim 22: Teo and Isobe disclose the interactive seamer of claim 16. Isobe further discloses wherein the user interface includes multiple view windows for simultaneously showing a perspectively correct view of the selected single view image and a changed view of the single view image (15:5-15.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the known technique of having simultaneous display windows of the same content, but from different perspectives as disclosed by Isobe to improve the similar device such as disclosed by Teo, i.e. panorama editing, in the same way to produce a predictable result.

Claim 23: <u>Teo</u> and <u>Isobe</u> disclose the interactive seamer of claim 16. <u>Teo</u> further discloses wherein the selected single view image with manually induced changes is capable of being repositioned within the panoramic image without disturbing the manually induced changes (8:17-39.)

Art Unit: 2174

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Teo</u> in view of <u>Isobe</u> et al., and in further view of <u>Cleary</u> et al. (4,470,779.)

Claim 20: Teo and Isobe disclose the interactive seamer of claim 16. However, Teo and Isobe do not disclose wherein at least one parameter specifies an artificial horizon in the panoramic image. Cleary discloses a similar system for panoramic display including specifying an artificial horizon in the panoramic image (Fig. 3A-3C.) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the known technique of Cleary of an artificial horizon to improve a similar device of panoramic displays of Teo and Isobe with user specified parameters in the same way to obtain a predictable result.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Belousov whose telephone number is (571) 270-1695. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (alternate Fri off) EST.

Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven P Sax/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

Page 8

AB

December 18, 2008